

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

BRIAN KAMEDULA,	)	3:10-cv-00160-ECR (WGC)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u></b>
	)	
vs.	)	December 19, 2011
	)	
ROBERT BANNISTER, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: JENNIFER COTTER REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

**MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:**

Plaintiff has filed a document entitled "Plaintiff's Request for Discovery (F.R.C.P. 34)." However, it does not appear plaintiff is asking for discovery from the defendants or any of them. Rather, plaintiff "requests" defendants' counsel to provide his medical and/or dental records "for an In Camera Review by the Court, further, that the records be submitted under seal." (Doc. #56.) Plaintiff does not state what he wants the court to do with the records if they were to be received for an *in camera* inspection.<sup>1</sup> For the court to review plaintiff's medical/dental records, they would have to accompany a motion or some other type of action required to be undertaken by the court.

Therefore, plaintiff's "request for discovery" (Doc. #56) is **DENIED without prejudice.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By:       /s/        
Deputy Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup> Per LR 26-8, discovery is not filed with the court.